REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant has reviewed and considered the Office Action dated September 10, 2004, and the references cited therewith.

No claims were amended, canceled, or added. Claims 1-20 are pending in this application.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-4, 6, 8-13, 15, and 17-19

Claims 1-4, 6, 8-13, 15, and 17-19 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,100,996 to Amano in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,655,174 to Hirst. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection as follows.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited documents do not teach or suggest all the elements recited in claim 1-4, 6, 8-13, 15, and 17-19. For example, the Examiner indicates that the Amano reference uses a humidity sensor to monitor system status, but does not teach "a humidity sensor to toner cartridge relationship to control system operation." The Examiner further indicates that "Hirst teaches a humidity sensor 46 for monitoring system changes and controlling system operation[s]," where the "humidity sensor 46 is located near the toner supply 48." The Examiner concludes by asserting that it "would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to place the humidity sensor of Amano near the toner as taught in Hirst in order to control system operation."

In contrast, independent claim 1 recites, in part,

a printer system that includes a first communication interface configured to receive a humidity value from a toner cartridge.

Applicant respectfully submits, however, that the Office Action did not particularly point out and the cited portions of the Amano reference and the Hirst reference do not teach or suggest what is being recited in claim 1. For example, Applicant is unable to find in the Office Action where the Amano reference or the Hirst reference teach or suggest a printer system that includes a first communication interface configured to receive a humidity value <u>from</u> a toner cartridge. As discussed above, the humidity sensor of the Amano reference might be taught to be

near the toner as taught in the Hirst reference in order to control system operation of the Hirst reference, but this configuration does not teach or suggest receiving a humidity value <u>from</u> a toner cartridge, as recited in claim 1.

Independent claim 10 recites, in part,

a method of operating a printer system that includes, in part, receiving a humidity value from a toner cartridge.

As discussed above, Applicant is unable to find in the Office Action where the Amano reference or the Hirst reference teach or suggest a method of operating a printer system that includes, in part, receiving a humidity value <u>from</u> a toner cartridge. The humidity sensor of the Amano reference might be taught to be <u>near</u> the toner as provided in the Hirst reference in order to control system operation of the Hirst reference, but this configuration does not teach or suggest receiving a humidity value <u>from</u> a toner cartridge, as recited in claim 10.

Independent claim 19 recites, in part,

a toner cartridge that includes, in part, a humidity sensor configured to detect a humidity level and generate a humidity value that corresponds to the humidity level.

As discussed above, Applicant is unable to find in the Office Action where the Amano reference or the Hirst reference teach or suggest a toner cartridge that includes, in part, a humidity sensor configured to detect a humidity level and generate a humidity value that corresponds to the humidity level. As indicated by the Examiner, the humidity sensor of the Amano reference might be taught to be near the toner as taught in the Hirst reference in order to control system operation of the Hirst reference, but this configuration does not teach or suggest that the a toner cartridge includes a humidity sensor configured to detect a humidity level and generate a humidity value that corresponds to the humidity level, as recited in claim 19.

Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action and the recited documents do not support a proper *prima facie* case of obviousness against claims 1-4, 6, 8-13, 15, and 17-19 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-4, 6, 8-13, 15, and 17-19.

Claims 5, 7, 14, 16, and 20

Claims 5, 7, 14, 16, and 20 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Amano reference and the Hirst reference as applied to claims 1-4, 6, 8,-13, 15, and 17-19 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,268,094 to Allen, *et al.* Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection as follows.

Claims 5, 7, 14, 16, and 20 each depend from one of independent claims 1, 10, or 19. Based upon the above arguments, Applicant respectfully submits the documents fail to support a *prima facie* case of obviousness. For example, the Amano reference and the Hirst reference do not teach or suggest, either independently or in combination, all the elements of claims 1, 10, or claim 19. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 5, 7, 14, 16, and 20.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at (360) 212-8052 to facilitate prosecution of this matter.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to the Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR §1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: MS AMENDMENT Commissioner for Patents, P.O. BOX 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this Movember, 2004.

By:

Jeffery L. Cameron Reg. No. 43,527

BROOKS & CAMERON, PLLC 1221 Nicollet Avenue, Suite 500

Respectfully Submitted,

By his Representatives,

Minneapolis, MN 55403

George H. Kerby

Date

Rev. 9/04